

Project Marking Scheme (COVID-19 Adjustments)

Part III	Range	Category	Typical Attributes
Prizeworthy (>85%)	91% - 100% A*	QUITE EXCEPTIONAL	
		<u>M</u>	Outstanding planning, progress, time management, and contingency planning
		<u>T</u>	Outstanding analysis (requirements, costs, benefits, and constraints), design (simulation, modelling and prototyping) and implementation; use of an extensive range of tools and techniques
		<u>E</u>	Outstanding testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
		<u>A</u>	Outstanding achievement, new and publishable results
		<u>W</u>	Extremely well written, structured and formatted, no spelling or grammatical errors; Extensive review of related work and references as in a typical research paper; Abstract can be read independently; verifiable word count not exceeding limit
		<u>U</u>	Evidence of extensive knowledge and understanding
	81% - 89% A+	ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS	
		<u>M</u>	Excellent planning, progress, time management, and contingency planning
		<u>T</u>	Excellent analysis (requirements, cost, benefits, and constraints), design (simulation, modelling and prototyping) and implementation; use of a wide range of tools and techniques
		<u>E</u>	Excellent testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
		<u>A</u>	Excellent achievement and results; innovation and creativity; worthy of publication/utilisation
		<u>W</u>	Very well written, structured and formatted, few spelling or grammatical errors; Review of related work, range of references including journal articles; Abstract can be read independently; verifiable word count not exceeding limit
		<u>U</u>	Evidence of shows considerable knowledge and understanding
First	71% - 79% A	EXCEPTIONAL FEATURES	
		<u>M</u>	Very good planning, progress, time management, and contingency planning
		<u>T</u>	Detailed analysis of requirements, costs and benefits; very well designed and implemented; use of simulation/modelling/prototyping and a range of tools and techniques
		<u>E</u>	Very good testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
		<u>A</u>	Significant achievement and results; innovation and creativity; worthy of utilisation
		<u>W</u>	Very well written, structured & formatted, review of related work including research papers; word count not exceeding limit specified for document type
		<u>U</u>	Evidence of good knowledge and understanding
		A SOLID PRODUCT	
2.1	61% - 69% B	<u>M</u>	Student worked well, planning and managing the work
		<u>T</u>	Good technical skills, well designed and implemented, with adequate analysis/modelling
		<u>E</u>	Well tested, good evaluation and reflection
		<u>A</u>	All major goals have been achieved, possibly worth of utilisation, a challenging project
		<u>W</u>	Well written, structured & formatted, review of related work, references to material used
		<u>U</u>	Evidence of good knowledge but less understanding

Part III	Range	Typical Attributes
2.2	51% - 59% C	CLOSE TO PROJECT'S BRIEF
		<u>M</u> Student worked steadily, needing guidance, the occasional lapse
		<u>T</u> Adequate technical skills, adequately designed and implemented, some analysis and modelling
		<u>E</u> Adequate testing and evaluation
		<u>A</u> Most major goals have been achieved, less significant challenge
		<u>W</u> Adequately written, structured & formatted, some background reading and references
		<u>U</u> Evidence of some knowledge but poor understanding
Third	41% - 49% D	SOME EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS
		<u>M</u> Student worked sporadically, loss of morale and initiative
		<u>T</u> Adequate technical skills, but with some weaknesses in analysis, design, and implementation
		<u>E</u> Partial testing and evaluation
		<u>A</u> Some major goals have been achieved, project not very challenging
		<u>W</u> Adequately written, some background reading, some errors in structure/format/contents
		<u>U</u> Evidence of a little knowledge but poor understanding
Fail	31% - 39% E	LITTLE EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS
		<u>M</u> Poor planning, needed considerable supervision
		<u>T</u> Poor technical skills, weak analysis, design and implementation
		<u>E</u> Little testing or evaluation
		<u>A</u> Little achievement or challenge
		<u>W</u> Poorly written and structured report, little evidence of background reading, poor referencing
		<u>U</u> Evidence of little knowledge and no, or hardly any understanding
	0% - 29% F	VERY LITTLE EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS
		<u>M</u> No, or very poor planning and progress
		<u>T</u> No, or very poor, technical skills, analysis, design, and implementation
		<u>E</u> No, or very poor, testing and evaluation
		<u>A</u> No, or very low, achievement and challenge
		<u>W</u> No, or badly written report; no or hardly any, references
		<u>U</u> Evidence of no, or hardly any, knowledge or understanding

Some of these categories include a range of aspects. Depending on the project topic and discipline, not all of these will apply, so examiners should award grades based on the relevant aspects only.

Legend

Category	Types of attributes
M	Project management and planning
T	Technical approach, engineering, analysis, modelling, design, use of tools
E	Testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
A	Achievement, innovation, creativity, challenge, research contribution
W	Report writing, structure, format, literature, references
U	Knowledge and understanding